

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2-6 and 10-15 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 7-9 have been canceled, and claims 1, 2, 6, and 10-15 have been amended. Claims 6, 12, 13, and 15 have been amended to improve their form, namely changing “and” to --or--, and “capable of switching” to --switchable--. Independent claims 1, 10, 12, 14, and 15 further have been amended to incorporate the first exposure setting features of original claim 2 or 11. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-4 and 7-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sato (USP 6,839,087) in view of Suzuki (USP 5,619,265). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sato in view of Suzuki and Takei (USP 5,510,837). Applicant traverses these rejections at least because the combination urged by the examiner would not have taught the first exposure setting features set forth in original claim 2 or 11, which features are now incorporated in independent claims 1, 10, 12, 14, and 15.

Specifically, each of independent claims 1, 10, 12, 14, and 15 now calls for acquiring information on characteristics of the taking lens from the taking lens and setting a first exposure compensation value according to both the acquired information on the taking lens characteristics and the field luminance information determined based on the photometric device.

In rejecting claim 2 and 11, the examiner asserts that Sato’s interchangeable lens 11 contains a circuit 17 that provides information on the lens characteristics to the system controller 31. Applicant disagrees with the examiner’s assessment because Sato merely discloses that the system controller 31 controls the lens focus via the circuit 17 and the diaphragm 16 via a diaphragm control circuit 32. See column 3, lines 16-33. Even if Sato were to disclose acquiring the lens characteristics for argument’s sake, Sato still would not have disclosed or taught setting the first exposure compensation value according to both the acquired lens characteristic information and the field luminance information, as now set forth in independent claims 1, 10, 12, 14, and 15. Note that the passage set forth in Sato’s column 2, lines 40-42, merely discloses calculating the exposure time using only the photometering value obtained

from its photometering sensor 52. Thus, Sato at best would have merely disclosed using luminance information to calculate an exposure compensation value.

As Takei would not have alleviated Sato's shortcomings noted above, applicant submits that the pending claims clearly distinguish over the applied references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

07 NOVEMBER 2007

DATE

/Lyle Kimms 110707/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. No. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826  
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)